

and lessons that are imparted upon young people and last a lifetime. The Boy Scouts of America has played a pivotal role in shaping the leaders of tomorrow and I look forward to seeing their continued contributions to our country.

Mr. Speaker, after the Bible, probably this manual, the Boy Scout Handbook, has done more to shape my life and made me the person that I am today.

#### VERMONT POSTAL SERVICE

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service is a mess. Today, we are about to take up a reform proposal that is long overdue.

Mail delivery in rural Vermont is critical for all our rural communities. For our seniors who rely on getting their checks and getting their prescriptions, and for Vermont businesses, from local papers that provide news in our country stores, it is crucial.

Mismanagement, underfunding, labor shortages have really created a crisis. Last January, my office received eight complaints. This January, it was 69 complaints. And some Vermonters are going over a week without getting any mail delivery. Our folks are going paycheck to paycheck and not getting their paycheck.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will finally get the United States Postal Service on track for our rural communities and all Americans. It is overdue, and that is why I hope all of us will support passage today.

#### RIISING DRUG PRICES

(Mr. LATURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LATURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an important issue that is deeply concerning to Kansans: Rising drug prices.

So far this year, the price of hundreds of lifesaving pharmaceutical medications have already increased. Hardworking Kansas families are facing skyrocketing inflation and many simply do not have the funds to keep up with the never-ending rise in healthcare costs.

For the past three decades, the bipartisan 340B program has helped low-income families afford essential medications by requiring pharmaceutical companies to give safety-net and rural healthcare providers discounts on prescription drugs. In my home State of Kansas, we have over 80 hospitals that use 340B savings. Not only do 340B hospitals provide heavily discounted prescription medications, they also make additional healthcare services, such as trauma care and substance abuse treatment available to most of our vulnerable patients.

As the 340B program celebrates its 30th anniversary, it is vital that we re-

affirm our commitment to protecting this program and ensuring all Kansans have access to quality and affordable healthcare.

#### WILD HORSE AND BURRO PROTECTION ACT

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, in efforts to control equine populations, the BLM is directed to humanely capture wild, free-roaming horses and burros and put them up for adoption.

BLM, however, uses helicopter companies to round up these animals, leading to frightening and sometimes deadly situations. At \$500 a head, since 2011, the top three helicopter contractors have raked in some \$37 million in taxpayer funding.

Last month, during a gathering at the Pancake Complex in central Nevada, a young colt was chased for miles by a helicopter, despite having a broken leg, and had to be put down when captured.

My Wild Horse and Burro Protection Act would outlaw the use of helicopters in wild horse roundups, employ more traditional wranglers for gathering efforts, and require the GAO to employ and explore humane alternatives to protect these icons of the wild west.

Mr. Speaker, put simply, save a horse, hire a cowboy.

#### BIDEN'S VOW TO END NORD STREAM 2

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, energy security for the free world is an imperative. I rise today to strongly endorse President Biden's vow yesterday that if Russia further invades Ukraine, there will, "no longer be a Nord Stream 2 pipeline across Europe. We will put an end to it."

During the Trump administration, this Russian energy pipeline was allowed to creep ever closer into the heart of Europe to make our closest NATO allies dependent on Russian gas. What a strategic failure.

Reliance on a tyrannical regime is dangerous. To our dear allies in Europe, if Putin were to succeed in clawing Ukraine back under Russia's command, he would not stop there.

The free world must place stronger sanctions on Nord Stream 2. It must ratchet up diplomat engagement to this strongest test of the rule of law since World War II. As Russian troops amass at Ukraine's border, the free world must deploy the defensive shield to protect her liberty and assure her territorial sovereignty through a coalition of the willing.

□ 1215

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3076, POSTAL SERVICE REFORM ACT OF 2021; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6617, FURTHER ADDITIONAL CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 912 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 912

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3076) to provide stability to and enhance the services of the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-32 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6617) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. (a) House Concurrent Resolution 69 is hereby adopted.

(b) For purposes of the joint session to receive the President of the United States on March 1, 2022, former Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall not be admitted to the Hall of the House or rooms leading thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MRVAN). The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), pending which I yield

myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we met in the Rules Committee and reported a rule, House Resolution 912, providing for consideration of two different measures; first, H.R. 3076, the Postal Service Reform Act of 2022, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform. It makes in order a manager's amendment and provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides for consideration of H.R. 6617, the Further Additional Extending Government Funding Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and provides for one motion to recommit.

Finally, the resolution adopts H. Con. Res. 69, which provides for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President, and the rule restricts former Members' access to the House floor during the joint session.

Mr. Speaker, the Postal Service Reform Act is a major update and improvement to what is going on with our post office. Even in this increasingly digital world, Americans rely on the U.S. Postal Service for access to life-saving prescription drugs and other essential items of living.

In the ongoing pandemic, the Postal Service has been critical in helping tens of millions of Americans vote safely and securely.

The Postal Service is processing an astounding 5,000 pieces of mail each second and is responsible for processing and delivering 46 percent of the world's mail.

It is no surprise that first class mail used to send things like letters and bills is on the decline in the digital environment we live in. Still, the Postal Service remains a critical lifeline, especially for people who live in rural areas and Tribal communities and for people with disabilities.

The Postal Service adds a million new delivery points each year. That means that the Postal Service is delivering a little bit less mail but to a lot more places.

This act addresses the financial needs of the Postal Service, ensuring that we can continue relying on it for generations to come.

The decline in first class mail, increasing expenses, and the requirement that the Postal Service prefund retiree

health benefits have all contributed to some financial instability in the Postal Service.

H.R. 3076 puts USPS on a far more stable financial footing. Specifically, it requires future Postal Service retirees to enroll in Medicare, saving the Postal Service \$22 billion over the next decade. While retirees have paid into Medicare their entire careers, a quarter of retirees choose not to enroll, requiring the Postal Service to pay for higher premiums.

Similarly, the legislation also eliminates the uniquely arduous requirement that USPS prefund retiree health benefits for a period of 75 years. No other company or governmental entity has this requirement, which has resulted in significant financial losses for USPS.

The Postal Service Reform Act also strengthens transparency and requires 6-day integrated delivery, ensuring high-quality mail service for at least 6 days a week to all Americans. It requires USPS to develop an online dashboard detailing weekly national and local-level performance data to promote compliance with on-time mail delivery.

Mr. Speaker, the consideration of this measure gives us the opportunity to celebrate the remarkable successes of the post office in our history. The Founders created the post office even before they signed the Declaration of Independence, and they named, of course, Benjamin Franklin as the first Postmaster General for the emerging Nation.

It was the post office that unified 13 divergent and quarreling Colonies into a nation as it created a great communications network that brought the news of the day and the news of public events to the doorstep of every fledgling American citizen. It was an idea that scandalized and horrified the European powers that, of course, always wanted to keep the people in the dark under the monarchies and aristocracies of Europe.

The post office also created the transportation system for America, which is why so many of our towns and cities have streets and roads called Post Road or Postal Road or Old Post Road running through the center of town.

The post office, of course, was an explicit delegation of power to Congress in the Constitution, as well as the power to build postal roads under Article I, Section 8.

The communications and transportation network created by the post office gave rise to the democratic political infrastructure of the Nation. This is how the committees of correspondence met that created the political will for the American Revolution and developed the political philosophy of our revolutionary forebearers.

The post office also gave rise to America's glorious free press. That is why so many of our newspapers, again, bear the name The Washington Post,

the Buffalo-Courier Express, the Richmond Times-Dispatch. They were named after the postal operation that made the mass media possible in the country.

The post office has done wonders for American commerce and business, and continues to do that right up to today, so this legislation will help the post office grow and meet our needs in the new century.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my friend from Maryland for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today makes in order H.R. 6617, a resolution to fund the Federal Government through March 11, 2022, and H.R. 3076, the Postal Service Reform Act of 2022.

I know that Appropriations Chairwoman DELAUNO and Ranking Member GRANGER continue to engage in bipartisan discussions to find a path forward on a fiscal year 2022 funding package, and I want to thank them sincerely for those efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend Chairwoman MALONEY and Ranking Member COMER for working together to put forth a truly bipartisan package to stabilize the financial health of the U.S. Postal Service and to improve efficiency and transparency for senior citizens and other Americans who rely every day on the Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, Democratic leadership has written major legislation behind closed doors with little to zero input from House Republicans and, frankly, almost zero to little input from even the committees that, of course, the Democrats control. This has truly been a behind-closed-door process that I have seen for the last 3 years.

So, it is finally refreshing to see the House consider a bill that was the subject of a robust bipartisan negotiation and that actually went through the normal committee process for once. I want to say that I hope my colleagues across the aisle will make this the new normal, as it has previously been the norm.

Mr. Speaker, I also hope the majority will continue the bipartisanship that I have seen here today and continue to work with House Republicans to address the serious and pressing issues facing American families across this Nation.

For example, thanks to President Biden's open border policy, deadly fentanyl continues to just pour across our southern border, which is ravaging our communities, literally killing people in the heartland of this country.

For example, in 2021, drug overdose deaths in the U.S. topped 100,000 for the first time in a single year. In fact, fentanyl overdoses are reported to be the leading cause of death for Americans aged 18 to 45. It is past time that Congress acts to stem the tide of deadly fentanyl coming into our Nation

largely through our porous southern border. The fentanyl that comes—let's just say it—is largely from China. It is time we address that issue.

At the same time, America is in the midst of a crime crisis like we haven't seen before, largely thanks to the Democrats' demonization of our police in what I view as one of the worst public policy positions I have ever seen, their push to actually defund police.

In 2021, at least 16 cities set new records in homicides. It is no wonder that 64 percent of Americans disapprove of how President Biden has handled crime. Congress should be working to address this crime surge and working to back the blue as well.

Finally, Americans continue to pay higher prices to do everything, from feed their families, heat their homes, and even fill up their gas tanks. Instead of doubling down on the failed far-left radical policies and out-of-control spending that actually caused this economic crisis, we should be reclaiming our energy independence. We should be eliminating burdensome regulations that hamstringing our job creators. And we should be working to ensure American families keep more of their hard-earned paychecks.

□ 1230

I want to applaud the bipartisanship work that went into these bills. I want to applaud the Committee on Oversight and Reform and, of course, the Committee on Appropriations. But there are many other pressing issues that we can also be working on and should be working on for the benefit of American families.

I therefore urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his kind words for the bipartisan leadership and initiative taken in the Postal Service Reform Act, H.R. 3076.

Unfortunately, I have to take exception to the suggestion that this is somehow unique on our part. The gentleman may remember the bipartisan infrastructure act that the Democrats brought forward but we incorporated lots of Republicans in the process and we passed it on a bipartisan basis. That is more than \$1 trillion invested in the roads, the highways, the ports, the airports, broadband, and cybersecurity.

That was something I remember was talked about during the last administration. I never saw a bill partisan, bipartisan, or otherwise come from that side of the aisle, but within the first year of the Biden administration that bipartisan infrastructure act was moved through Congress. We brought lots of Republicans in. I know a lot of them voted against it, some of whom are claiming credit for it back in their districts now.

But, in any event, this is not new for us. It takes two to tango. So I am glad

that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognizing what we are doing here, but it is hardly unique in terms of the leadership being offered.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of bipartisan leadership, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who is the chairwoman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership.

I rise today in strong support of the rule on my bill, H.R. 3076, the Postal Service Reform Act. The Postal Service Reform Act has been years in the making, and I am proud to say that it is bipartisan.

As we all know, the Postal Service is one of our Nation's most vital and respected institutions. It provides service to every American no matter where they live, binding us together in a way no other organization does.

What's more, it is one of the oldest institutions in the United States. In fact, the Postal Service is older than the United States. It has been operating in some form since 1775 when Benjamin Franklin was appointed the first Postmaster General by the Continental Congress.

Ensuring that this vital American institution has the tools that it needs to prosper and serve the American people for years to come is of the highest priority. This bill does just that. This bill would require postal employees to enroll in Medicare when they are eligible and retire. All postal employees already pay into Medicare through their careers, and the Postal Service has paid about \$35 billion into the program since 1983, and it is the second largest contributor to the Medicare trust fund.

In short, Postal Service employees have already earned these benefits. The bill would also eliminate the unfair requirement that the Postal Service prefund its retiree health benefits for 75 years into the future, a provision that has already passed the House in previous Congresses. These two reforms would save the Postal Service nearly \$50 billion over 10 years.

I want to emphasize that these changes do not cost American taxpayers one single dime. In fact, the nonpartisan CBO just last week determined that this bill would save \$1.5 billion over the next 10 years.

In addition to these savings, the bill includes a provision that will allow the Postal Service to work with States and localities to provide non-postal service in post office locations. This provision would allow the Postal Service to more effectively serve communities based on their individual needs and raise revenue from currently untapped sources.

It is abundantly clear that this bill is good for both the Postal Service and the American people.

I thank Representative COMER for working diligently with me on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this rule.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her very lucid remarks.

One other historic breakthrough of the post office, I am recalling now, is the fact that it was the first Federal public institution to provide for the hiring of women, African Americans, and other minority groups. So I am glad, again, that we have got bipartisan support for this really critical measure to reform the post office in different ways in order to make it viable in the new century.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, rise in opposition to this postal reform bill not because it does nothing good but because it doesn't do enough.

The post office is a constitutionally authorized yet failed organization. It has failed to make a profit. It has failed to properly serve the American people, and everyone who has a mailbox knows it.

I am pleased that this body and the ranking member are tackling postal issues, but this is not sufficient reform. Unfortunately, for that reason, I cannot support this bill.

The problems with the post office are clear and longstanding. Congress established the post office to be a self-supporting organization, and from the time it received a \$100 billion-line of credit, it has simply used credit to cover its losses.

I could agree that prepayment would not be necessary if they were meeting their responsibility on a pay-as-you-go basis to be profitable and to make those reforms. In fact, in 2020, under the CARES Act, Congress provided \$10 billion in emergency funding, and yet in 2020 they lost \$18 billion and are on course over the next 18 months to lose \$22 billion. The fact is they haven't made a profit since 2006 as they are mandated.

The truth is the post office isn't lacking liquidity. It is bankrupt, and nothing in this bill will make the post office truly solvent. It simply wipes out and wipes away debts and shifts the burden on to taxpayers. The bill forgives \$46 billion in debts owed by the Postal Service forcing the taxpayers to pay it.

Years ago, when I offered real reform, reform that would save on a constant basis real money, 6, 7, \$8 billion a year, those reforms, because they lowered total labor, were unacceptable to the post office even if they were through attrition.

I do support some of the changes, and I do support the Post Master's attempt to modernize the post office, but without teeth in the actual organizational reforms, the post office will continue

to lose money, and for that reason I cannot yet support this bill.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, while I respect my good friend and colleague, especially for what he has done in the private sector as well as the public sector, I do have some concerns.

I believe the Postal Service Reform Act is a strong bipartisan act, and I urge its passage. This measure will bring increased transparency. It will improve operations for senior citizens and Americans who use the Postal Service every day. It will help this institution that is critical, especially to rural America.

Again, I have deep respect and admiration for my friend from California. I just would urge passage of this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a quick note on the gentleman from California's points. He concedes that our bipartisan legislation does a lot of good things, but he says that it doesn't do everything.

He makes the point that the post office is not making a profit. That is true. It is not making a profit. Of course, our offices don't make a profit. There are very few Federal entities that make a profit. That is not what government does. Government serves the people. We want to be as efficient as possible in doing that, but the post office serves people from Alaska to Hawaii to Puerto Rico to Florida to Texas.

Everybody gets mail, and we want to do it as efficiently and as effectively as possible, but the point is to make sure that we are all connected and that everybody gets the benefit of being able to get their prescription drugs, that small businesses are able to send out their parcels, that consumers are able to receive what it is they are ordering, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), who is a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for as long as our country has existed, the United States Postal Service has played a critical role in the function of our country.

Whether delivering news or bills, medicine or ballots, income tax refunds or in a few days maybe Valentines, Americans—our small businesses and our State, national, and local governments—rely on the post office and the essential daily services it provides.

The famous motto of the Postal Service is: "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

How glad we have been to see them completing those rounds during a pandemic which limited our ability to get goods and services from other places and which limited our ability in some cases to get to the polling places.

While the U.S. Postal Service has always been essential, in the last 2 years it has been even more so, as it has helped us all to navigate a highly transmissible virus.

Unfortunately, during that same time, we have seen the Postal Service struggle to navigate a series of highly disruptive policy changes that slowed service and financial constraints that have threatened its long-term health. Over the past 2 years I have heard from hundreds of constituents about problems with the Postal Service, all asking: What is Congress going to do about it?

This week, I am proud to support the Postal Service Reform Act, a bipartisan bill that will improve the performance of the U.S. Postal Service and guarantee its long-term financial health.

This bill will guarantee the Postal Service's 6-day delivery standard, improve customer support, and provide customers with increased transparency about their local service performance. Most notably, the Postal Service Reform Act will finally end the—unique to the Postal Service—statutory requirement that it prefund retiree health benefits, relieving the Postal Service of this onerous and unnecessary burden that has jeopardized the service's finances since it was enacted 15 years ago.

These reforms which have been endorsed by the postal unions are estimated to save the Postal Service nearly \$50 billion over the next 10 years.

The U.S. Postal Service is one of the oldest, core responsibilities of the Federal Government, and so I look forward to enthusiastically voting for this bill to ensure its continued success in the 21st century.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, today's rule also provides for consideration of another continuing resolution to fund the government. The House did its job. We passed our funding bills on time, and Chairwoman DELAUNO has pushed her Senate counterparts to begin negotiations early so that a funding deal could be passed on time. However, Senate Republicans have hemmed and hawed and stalled to avoid negotiations because they prefer a CR to finding bipartisan compromise. We are nearly halfway through the current fiscal year. I regret the necessity of another CR, but I look forward to a quick resolution and a vote on an omnibus funding bill.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I do want to add one point to Ms. SCANLON's excellent delivery.

This legislation, the Postal Service Reform Act, requires the Postal Service to develop an online dashboard that will detail for all of us weekly national and local-level performance data to promote compliance at every level with the on-time mail delivery expectations that we all have.

I too have spent time in a lot of neighborhoods of mine in Frederick County, Carroll County, and Montgomery County making sure that the

Postal Service is getting on time delivery and making it happen. This new tool will allow all of us to monitor exactly what is going on in our particular communities.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. BURGESS), who is my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as you have already heard, today's rule provides for consideration of yet another continuing resolution 5 months into the fiscal year and not a single appropriations bill has been signed into law.

This time, the Rules Committee had less than 2 hours' notice before considering the continuing resolution rule in the Rules Committee yesterday leaving no time for Members who might want to offer an amendment or might want to come to the committee to speak on this CR.

□ 1245

This is no secret. This has not been an easy year for the American people; crisis after crisis, and this Democratic leadership in this Congress has not really led on those issues. We are still facing a crisis on our southern border. Mr. Speaker, 2 million migrants have crossed without documentation since President Biden took the oath of office. And in response, what did he do? Well, he halted construction on the border wall, and he tried to eliminate the remain in Mexico program except the courts wouldn't let him do that, so now they are slow-walking the enforcement.

At the same time, Ukraine is facing down 130,000 Russian troops that look poised to invade, and President Biden just recently used his waiver authority to ease the sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, a direct link between Russia and Europe for oil and gas. If we had been given time to consider this CR, we could have revoked this waiver authority and reinstated sanctions on the Nord Stream 2.

Another problem exacerbated by this administration is their continued push for vaccine mandates. We see it literally every day on the news. Mandates do nothing but drive unnecessary opposition, and we need to let people make an informed choice for themselves with their doctor. Taxpayer dollars should not be spent on enforcing mandates.

Finally, it has been nearly impossible to get a response back from the executive branch agency and the reason is, we have delegated our spending authority. We have delegated our appropriations authority basically to the Speaker's Office, and as a consequence, no Cabinet Secretary feels obligated to answer a phone call from a Member of Congress from either party.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6617, of course, extends funding for the Federal Government until March 11, 2022.

We eagerly anticipate the success of bipartisan negotiations for the full omnibus package.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule providing for consideration of the Postal Service Reform Act. As the only Member of Congress who has a 30-year career as a Postal Service employee, I am honored to stand here today as the House takes action to protect the Postal Service for generations to come.

Few know that the Constitution defines that America will have a post office service. For more than two centuries, the hardworking employees of the Postal Service have lived up to the agency's motto: "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds."

As the agency finds itself losing billions of dollars, it is time for the Congress to step in and ensure the Postal Service can maintain its commitment to providing prompt and reliable mail service. This bill will provide the Postal Service with the critical reforms to help address this long-term financial solvency. The Postal Service has delivered the package. Today we have the opportunity to deliver the package.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for those excellent remarks and note that I think she speaks for millions of postal workers across the country who are excited about this legislation and the reforms that it is going to institute. This has the endorsement of the American Postal Workers Union, the National Association of Letter Carriers, the mail handlers, and a number of other organizations that are invested in this. So we are excited about this bipartisan investment in making the Postal Service work for the people in this new century.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Across this country, Democratic Governors and local officials have forced children to wear masks in schools. They have done this without real concern for the social developmental and emotional consequences of their authoritarian actions. These are the actions of petty tyrants, people who do not care about real science.

In stark contrast, House Republicans have been consistent this whole time. We have been fighting for the rights of America's children, and the American parent.

That is why if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 6619, the Unmask Our Kids Act. This legislation would block education agencies from receiving Federal funding unless schools are open for in-person learning and school mask

mandates allow parents to opt out on behalf of their children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD along with any extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, here to explain the amendment is the legislation's author, Representative ASHLEY HINSON of Iowa, my good friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. HINSON).

Mrs. HINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand for students, to stand for parents' ability to make decisions for their own kids. Across the country, children are struggling. Despite being nearly 2 years into the pandemic now, tens of thousands of students started this year off still being forced to learn from behind a screen, cut off from their peers.

Many school districts are mandating masks for children of all ages against their parents' wishes. Parents should have the option to send their kids to school in person and to decide whether or not they want to have their kids wearing a mask at school. Thanks to the leadership of our great Governor of Iowa, Governor Reynolds, and our hardworking teachers in Iowa, parents have had the option to send their kids to school in person in class for over a year.

Governor Reynolds stood for families by banning school mask mandates and allowing parents—parents—to make this personal health decision for their own children. That is at the heart of this issue we are talking about today. Parents should be empowered. They should be empowered to make choices that impact their children's physical and mental health, their development, and their future.

As a mom, I know why parents across the country are standing up and speaking out when they are being told that they can't decide what is right for their kids or their family. And it is infuriating to watch the very same people who push for kids to wear masks all day long, and they are bending the rules for a photo op or maybe a night out on the town. Meanwhile, kids are sitting at home instead of going to school, and they are interacting with their friends in settings that are not normal. They are interacting from behind a screen. That is why I introduced the Unmask Our Kids Act.

My bill would condition Federal education dollars to schools on those schools doing two very simple things: one, schools cannot receive Federal dollars if they enact wide-reaching mask mandates. They have to allow parents to decide whether their child will wear a mask at school; and two,

parents have to have an in-person learning option. Schools must offer an in-person learning option. Our kids deserve normalcy. They deserve a chance to learn in person. They deserve a chance to play with their friends at recess.

This is about giving parents a voice and the final say when it comes to personal health decisions that impact their family. This is about giving school-aged kids who have endured so much over the last 2 years a chance to finally just be kids, to be normal. The next generation is too important not to fight for.

When it comes to our children and their well-being, we will not cave, and that is why this legislation is so important. So let's put politics aside here. Let's put kids first. We should pass the Unmask Our Kids Act today.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The Washington Post this morning has an article about how a number of Governors—California Governor Gavin Newsom, New Jersey Governor Phil Murphy, Delaware Governor John Carney, and Connecticut Governor Ned Lamont—have all announced changes to indoor masking requirements because of changes of where we are in the disease.

I certainly hope that my colleagues are not saying that we never should have worn masks, although I know some of them have said that and some of them have opposed masking guidance from the very beginning. Need I remind my colleagues that we have lost more than 900,000 people, including a lot of children, to this terrible disease. We have faced an epidemic of denialism from the beginning. Of course, the former President of the United States was out hawking quack medical cures and denying the virulence of the disease for a long time saying it would just disappear at Eas-tertime. Maybe everybody should just be injected with bleach.

We have come a long way from then, and President Biden has led us in an aggressive scientific effort, including masking where it was appropriate, in order to beat the disease, and we are making great progress. Now the States and localities are able to drop the masking requirements. So I see that they want to get on top of the wave and somehow claim that they are responsible for that when it was the President from their party who presided over an historically reckless and irresponsible approach to COVID-19, one that gave us a leading position in the spread of COVID-19.

So in any event, I haven't seen the bill that they have just introduced yet. I know that the Biden administration has used the post office to ship 500 million coronavirus test kits to people across the country, which, again, underscores the importance of the legislation we are really here to talk about today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that my good friend from Maryland would say the former President was “reckless” during the pandemic. This is a man who put together Operation Warp Speed, one of the quickest vaccination programs and one of the most effective the world has ever seen.

If we are talking about numbers, let's just talk about the numbers. More people have died in this pandemic under Joe Biden than ever died under President Trump. The numbers don't lie. During President Trump's first year with the pandemic, there were just over 390,000 deaths and, again, every death is tragic. But to say that President Trump was reckless, look at the numbers of Joe Biden. Since Joe Biden has taken office, over half a million people, 500,000-plus people have died.

So if President Trump was reckless, what word would you use to describe President Biden? I am interested to hear that. But there are two kinds of science; there is real science and there is political science. The risk of severe disease from COVID-19 to healthy children is very low. This is real science. The CDC data shows that 863 total pediatric deaths related to COVID-19 have occurred since the beginning of this pandemic, which is less than—and, again, for the party of science, this is real science—that is less than 0.001 percent of all COVID deaths in the United States. Many of these children had underlying medical conditions making them more vulnerable to severe COVID-19 than the average child, meaning that many of these children died with COVID not of COVID.

But again, that is real science, not political science. Talking about real science versus political science, I have got a photo of Stacey Abrams. This is political science, and here is why. Because the kids in this photo trying to learn, all of them are masked up. Statistically, these children are at very low risk of contracting COVID and even lower risk of dying from COVID. Again, the stats don't lie; 0.001 percent.

The real person in this photo who bears most of the risk is a governor-in-exile Stacey Abrams who is not wearing a mask. This photo is political science. If the mask wearing was reversed, that would be actual science.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. LATURNER), my good friend.

Mr. LATURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6619 which will prohibit local education agencies from receiving Department of Education funding unless schools are open for in-person learning, and allow parents to opt out of mask mandates on behalf of their children.

Over the past 2 years, our children have suffered academically and socially throughout the pandemic. As a father of four young children, I know

how important it is that kids are back in the classroom and free of unnecessary and distracting mask mandates. Parents, not politicians, should have the power to make the best decisions for their children. Let me repeat that because so many across this country and some in this body don't understand that fundamental truth. Parents, not politicians, should have the power to make the best decision for their children. And that includes whether or not they wear a mask in school.

It has been over a year since the CDC implemented universal mask mandates in schools with little science to back up their claim. Studies have shown that students can safely return to prepandemic educational settings; meaning in a classroom and without a mask.

The House has also appropriated \$120 billion to reopen schools, nearly three times what the CDC had requested. Yet, we still have school districts across our country refusing to return to in-person learning or forcing kids to wear a mask against their will.

These school districts should not be given any more hard-earned taxpayer dollars from the Department of Education or any other Federal agency.

□ 1300

To make matters worse, the same elected officials who are implementing these draconian mandates are often seen disregarding them completely. The lengths some elected officials will go to gain a political advantage at the expense of the well-being of our children is truly astounding.

The reality is, my colleagues across the aisle are not following the science, and it is damaging an entire generation's educational and social development.

It is time we give parents the power to let their kids experience normal once again. I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and support H.R. 6619.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania doesn't have to take it from me. He can take it from President Trump's own Coronavirus Response Coordinator, Deborah Birx.

Dr. Birx said the first 100,000 deaths were perhaps inevitable, but the hundreds of thousands that came after it were avoidable and were the cost of the failure to undertake the public health precautions that were required. So, I would direct him to Dr. Birx.

Of course, when the virus was out of control and President Biden came into office, he was doing everything in his power to try to reverse the damage done by the lethal irresponsibility of the prior administration.

But in any event, Madam Speaker, we are here to try to get beyond all the wreckage at this point. We are here to fund the government through March 11. We are here to make these substantial reforms to the post office, on a bipar-

tisan basis, that will make the post office far more efficient; that will guarantee 6-day service to our people all over the country; that will end that uniquely difficult and punitive policy of making the Postal Service alone have to prefund everybody's healthcare for the next 75 years, which explains a lot of its financial problems. That is what we are here to do today.

We are making progress for America, and we are trying to do it on a bipartisan basis. It seems strange to me that my colleagues would try to pick a fight about COVID-19 in this context when we are just trying to recover from the wreckage left by the prior administration.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend from Maryland referenced Dr. Birx. Let's be honest: Dr. Birx is an unelected career bureaucrat who has been wrong repeatedly, just like Dr. Fauci has been wrong repeatedly.

Although my friend on the left might cite Dr. Birx, I can cite Johns Hopkins University, which just did a study. According to this massive study from Johns Hopkins University—not a bastion of conservative ideology, I might add—they found that lockdowns only reduced COVID mortality by 0.2 percent in the United States. In sum, lockdowns didn't work at all.

What is worse is that those on the left have failed to take into account that the lockdowns actually led to more deaths than they prevented, arguably, with drug overdose and suicide. But that is real science, not political science.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS) to talk about more real science.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that the House can immediately consider Congresswoman HINSON's H.R. 6619, the Unmask Our Kids Act.

The Unmask Our Kids Act would restrict funds from going to any local education agencies that don't offer an option for in-person instruction at both elementary and secondary public schools. Further, the Unmask Our Kids Act would allow parents to opt their child out of having to wear a mask at school.

As the mother of two children, I understand how important it is for all kids to be in school, learning among their peers. Unfortunately, throughout the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been a political theater of both masking policies and virtual learning, which has resulted in K-12 students paying the price through learning loss, which is at an even higher rate among students who come from disadvantaged families.

Several studies have found that there are adverse effects on the quality of



education due to the lack of time students spend with their peers, especially for students who struggled with school before the pandemic. Students need and deserve to have in-person instruction so that they can receive the best education possible for their future.

As a physician and former director of public health, I recognize that children are at low risk of severe illness with COVID and low risk of transmission. A recent study found that grade-schoolers are at a lower risk than vaccinated adults.

Wearing a mask at school can create both behavioral and physical complications for students. A student wearing a pair of glasses may have to keep defogging their lenses, or a student that has a facial tic may have to keep correcting their fallen mask.

As we have seen across the Nation, mental health has been a big part of this pandemic, and students are not immune to this impact. Not being able to see other peers or your teacher's face can lead to only further loneliness, anxiety, and depression, and the rate of suicide in children as young as 9 has been staggering. Many young students are also unable to learn because facial expressions are absent.

Just yesterday, New Jersey's Democratic Governor announced that, beginning in March, the State will no longer require students and school employees to wear masks. The Governor was quoted saying that: "This is not a declaration of victory as much as an acknowledgment that we can responsibly live with this thing." Europe has had that policy for almost a year.

Beginning this Friday, the Governor of Delaware, the President's home State, will lift Delaware's universal indoor mask mandate, with a lift on the school-based mask mandate beginning March 31.

Also yesterday, a medical analyst for CNN said that the decision to wear a mask should shift from a government mandate to an individual choice.

If a parent and student believe it is in the best interests of their health and well-being to wear a mask, so be it. Let them make that decision for themselves. We do not need elite, powerful people imposing their will upon our most innocent and most powerless.

Remove the mask. Let students be back in school. And vote down the previous question.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Someone just tuning in right now might be a little confused and think that we are somehow debating COVID-19. We are here to talk about bipartisan legislation on the Postal Service and to keep the government open until March 11.

I would just point out to my good friend from Pennsylvania, who I am afraid seemed to disparage science on our side or the professional credentials of Dr. Deborah Birx, who was the former President's coronavirus coordinator; she went to Penn State medical

school. I don't think the gentleman from Pennsylvania meant to disparage her educational credentials, certainly as a graduate of Penn State.

Look, we don't need the Federal Government dictating to the States and the localities what their policies are going to be about masking. I just read this morning about a bunch of States—I think they have Democratic Governors; New York, California, Delaware—that have pulled back on their masking policies because the virus, today, has dramatically subsided.

Are we going to pass a Federal bill every time the virus goes up or the virus goes down and tell them what their rules are going to be? Come on. I thought that we were all champions of federalism. But instead, they want to dictate it from up on high.

Remember, what this legislation is about—and I wish we could focus more on it—is reform of the Postal Service.

We have bipartisan support now for this. I am delighted to learn that it is not just the postal unions that I invoked before, but we have a bunch of postal associations for it. We have the American Postal Workers Union, the National Association of Letter Carriers, the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, the National Association of Postal Supervisors, the National Active and Retired Federal Employees, the National Postal Mail Handlers Union, the Package Shippers Association, the Major Mailers Association, the National Newspaper Association, Coalition for a 21st Century Postal Service, Publishers Clearing House, American Catalog Mailers Association, and the National Retail Federation.

We have both the workers in the Postal Service and then big businesses and small businesses across the country, underscoring the fact that the Postal Service remains the central nervous system of commerce in America as well as our public life. That is something that we should be celebrating rather than picking an unnecessary fight, which is completely irrelevant to this legislation, about what is going on at the State and local level in other places.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Madam Speaker, look, for the record, I would bet on Dr. MILLER-MEEKS any day of the week over Dr. Birx. She believes in the real science, not the political theater and political science that the CDC and Dr. Birx speak of. A great example: The CDC never even studied the effects of school mask mandates before mandating masks in school.

Say what you will, but that is not how science works.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), who is my good friend.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to oppose the previous question so we can immediately consider H.R. 6619, the Unmask Our Kids Act.

This is critical because, as a Member of Congress, but more importantly as a

dad of a kindergartner, I am frustrated. I am frustrated because all throughout the pandemic, bureaucrats, mayors, Governors, and school administrators have all lectured us to follow the science. Just follow the science.

Well, I agree. Thankfully, 2 years into this pandemic, we now have science behind the mild impacts of COVID-19 on children and the importance of ventilation instead of masking to limit spread in classrooms. We also have science on how important it is to see faces for a child's development.

Yet, even with this data, schools continue to impose mask mandates, including roughly 85 of the 115 North Carolina school districts. And if you break these mandates, you face severe consequences.

Just last Thursday, 12-year-old Lincoln Matthews, from my district, decided not to wear a mask to school, with the support of his father. Lincoln said he can't breathe in his mask, especially when he is forced to wear it even while running in PE class. However, Lincoln was written up and kicked out for insubordination. This is wrong.

What is worse is, these rules apparently don't apply to everyone. On Friday, just 1 day after Lincoln was kicked out for not wearing his mask, Stacey Abrams visited a classroom in Georgia without a mask while every child around her, as you can see, wore their masks. As my colleague, Mr. RESCIENTHALER, said, this photo is not science; this photo is political science.

Sadly, this is just the latest example of politicians who want to control your life. They tell you what to do then ignore their own rules. For these hypocrites, it is rules for thee but not for me.

Well, I am here to say that the American people are fed up. I am here to say, parents have rights.

So let's actually follow the science. It is time to scrap these mandates and give parents the freedom to choose what is best for their own children.

Today, I encourage my colleagues to pass the Unmask Our Kids Act and end these mandates once and for all. If it is good enough for the politicians, it is good enough for our kids.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Madam Speaker, talking about more science, here is some more science: A North Carolina study, where my good friend resides, conducted before vaccines were available, found that not a single case of student-to-teacher transmission occurred when 90,000 students were in school. That is the real science.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time as I am prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, thanks to President Biden and thanks to House Democrats and their far left, radical policies, Americans are currently facing a border crisis, a crime crisis, and an economic crisis.

Despite a lack of scientific evidence to support masks in schools, Democratic Governors, officials, unelected bureaucrats, petty tyrants, have mandated the use of masks in schools, damaging the educational and social development of our students. It is past time that Democrats stop prioritizing their woke agenda and work with Republicans to address these and other pressing issues facing American families today.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question; I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule; and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to say a word on behalf of Stacey Abrams, who was the target of some rhetorical attacks over there.

There is a picture of her without her mask on in front of a bunch of kids who did have their masks on, and it was being denounced by the speaker from North Carolina momentarily and also by the floor leader, who didn't have their masks on, standing in front of a whole group of people who did have their masks on.

In other words, they were in exactly the same position Stacey Abrams was, because the rule of reason we have adopted according to medical advice, I think across the country, is where masks are recommended and indicated, people wear them unless they are speaking. To turn that into a political football to denounce a fellow public servant seems to be a little bit beneath the dignity of this body.

But in any event, we are very excited about our postal reform legislation that we are moving through to guarantee excellent 6-day service to everybody, to have an online dashboard so we can all keep track of where the mail is in different parts of the country, and if there are problems, we can address them quickly.

I am glad we have bipartisan legislation—at least I hope it is bipartisan—to keep the government open until March 11.

As for COVID-19 policies, I think we should trust the States and the localities to deal with the manifold questions that come up as we continue to address this public health crisis, which was, of course, set into motion by a President who denied it, avoided it, said he would refuse to wear a mask even when it was indicated, who got it, who had dozens of doctors at his beck and call, who flew in a helicopter to get himself served.

Look, we need to get back on track in America. That means the government has to work for everybody. We have got to stop fighting about public health. We have got to work together for public health, just like we have got to work together for the post office, a great American institution which we improve and we advance today in the 21st century.

The material previously referred to by Mr. RESCIENTHALER is as follows:

#### AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 912

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 6619) to prohibit the Secretary of Education from providing Federal funds to a local educational agency unless in-person instruction is available to all students and parents may opt out of student mask mandates, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6619.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LAWRENCE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RESCIENTHALER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 205, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—221

Adams	Cleaver	Gomez
Aguilar	Clyburn	Gonzalez,
Allred	Cohen	Vicente
Auchincloss	Connolly	Gotthelmer
Axne	Cooper	Green, Al (TX)
Barragán	Correa	Grijalva
Bass	Costa	Harder (CA)
Beatty	Courtney	Hayes
Bera	Craig	Higgins (NY)
Beyer	Crist	Himes
Bishop (GA)	Crow	Horsford
Blumenauer	Cuellar	Houlahan
Blunt Rochester	Davidson (KS)	Hoyer
Bonamici	Davis, Danny K.	Huffman
Bourdeaux	Dean	Jackson Lee
Bowman	DeFazio	Jacobs (CA)
Boyle, Brendan	DeGette	Jayapal
F.	DeLauro	Jeffries
Brown (MD)	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Brown (OH)	Delgado	Johnson (TX)
Brownley	Demings	Jones
Bush	DeSaunier	Kahele
Bustos	Deutch	Kaptur
Butterfield	Dingell	Keating
Carbajal	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Cárdenas	Doyle, Michael	Khanna
Carson	F.	Kildee
Carter (LA)	Escobar	Kilmer
Cartwright	Eshoo	Kim (NJ)
Case	Espallat	Kind
Casten	Evans	Kirkpatrick
Castor (FL)	Fletcher	Krishnamoorthi
Castro (TX)	Foster	Kuster
Cherfilus-	Frankel, Lois	Lamb
McCormick	Gallego	Langevin
Chu	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Ciциlline	Garcia (IL)	Larson (CT)
Clark (MA)	Garcia (TX)	Lawrence
Clarke (NY)	Golden	Lawson (FL)

Lee (CA)	Omar	Slotkin
Lee (NV)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Leger Fernandez	Panetta	Soto
Levin (CA)	Pappas	Spanberger
Levin (MI)	Pascarell	Speier
Lieu	Payne	Stansbury
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Stanton
Lowenthal	Peters	Stevens
Luria	Phillips	Strickland
Lynch	Pingree	Suozi
Malinowski	Pocan	Swalwell
Maloney,	Porter	Takano
Carolyn B.	Pressley	Thompson (CA)
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Manning	Quigley	Titus
Matsui	Raskin	Tlaib
McBath	Rice (NY)	Tonko
McCollum	Ross	Torres (CA)
McEachin	Roybal-Allard	Torres (NY)
McGovern	Ruiz	Trahan
McNerney	Ruppersberger	Trone
Meeks	Rush	Underwood
Meng	Ryan	Vargas
Mfume	Sánchez	Veasey
Moore (WI)	Sarbanes	Vela
Morelle	Scanlon	Velázquez
Moulton	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Mrvan	Schiff	Schultz
Murphy (FL)	Schneider	Waters
Nadler	Schrader	Watson Coleman
Napolitano	Schrier	Welch
Neal	Scott (VA)	Wexton
Neguse	Scott, David	Wild
Newman	Sewell	Williams (GA)
Norcross	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
O'Halleran	Sherrill	Yarmuth
Ocasio-Cortez	Sires	

NAYS—205

Aderholt	Foxx	Lucas
Allen	Franklin, C.	Luetkemeyer
Amodei	Scott	Mace
Arrington	Fulcher	Malliotakis
Babin	Gaetz	Mann
Bacon	Gallagher	Massie
Baird	Garbarino	Mast
Balderson	Garcia (CA)	McCarthy
Banks	Gibbs	McCaul
Barr	Jimenez	McClain
Bentz	Gonzales, Tony	McClintock
Bergman	Gonzalez (OH)	McHenry
Bice (OK)	Good (VA)	McKinley
Biggs	Gooden (TX)	Meijer
Bilirakis	Gosar	Meuser
Bishop (NC)	Graves (LA)	Miller (IL)
Boebert	Graves (MO)	Miller (WV)
Bost	Green (TN)	Miller-Meeks
Brady	Greene (GA)	Moolenaar
Brooks	Griffith	Mooney
Buchanan	Grothman	Moore (AL)
Buck	Guest	Moore (UT)
Bucshon	Guthrie	Mullin
Budd	Hagedorn	Murphy (NC)
Burchett	Harris	Nehls
Burgess	Harshbarger	Newhouse
Calvert	Hartzler	Norman
Cammack	Hern	Oberholte
Carey	Herrell	Owens
Carl	Herrera Beutler	Palazzo
Carter (GA)	Hice (GA)	Palmer
Carter (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Pence
Cawthorn	Hill	Perry
Chabot	Hinson	Pfleger
Cheney	Hollingsworth	Posey
Cline	Hudson	Reed
Cloud	Huizenga	Reschenthaler
Clyde	Issa	Rice (SC)
Cole	Jackson	Rodgers (WA)
Comer	Jacobs (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Rose
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Rosendale
Davidson	Jordan	Rouzer
Davis, Rodney	Joyce (OH)	Roy
DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)	Rutherford
Diaz-Balart	Katko	Salazar
Donalds	Keller	Scalise
Duncan	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Dunn	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Emmer	Kim (CA)	Sessions
Estes	Kustoff	Simpson
Fallon	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Feenstra	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Ferguson	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Fischbach	LaTurner	Smucker
Fitzgerald	Lesko	Spartz
Fitzpatrick	Letlow	Staubert
Fleischmann	Long	Steel
Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Stefanik



Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany  
Timmons  
Turner

Upton  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Duyne  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)

Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams (TX)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Young  
Zeldin

DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
DesSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael

Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lieu  
Lofgren

Rice (NY)  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff

LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Mace

Nehls  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Oberholte  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Pfluger  
Posey

Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiffany

Armstrong  
Ellzey  
Gohmert

## NOT VOTING—7

Granger  
Kinzinger  
LaHood

□ 1355

Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Messrs. ROUZER and BOST changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)  
Bass (Takano)  
Bera (Correa)  
Bowman  
(Jeffries)  
Boyle, Brendan  
F. (Beyer)  
Brooks (Moore)  
(AL)  
Brownley (Meng)  
Clarke (NY)  
(Kelly (IL))  
Cohen (Beyer)  
Cooper (Beyer)  
Crist  
(Wasserman  
Schultz)  
Cuellar (Correa)  
DeSaulnier  
(Raskin)  
Doggett (Raskin)  
Dunn (Joyce)  
(PA)  
Fallon (Ellzey)  
Frankel, Lois  
(Meng)  
Garamendi  
(Correa)  
Garbarino  
(Katko)  
Gonzalez (OH)  
(Balderson)

Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
(Correa)  
Gosar (Gaetz)  
Grijalva (Garcia  
(IL))  
Hagedorn (Carl)  
Huffman (Gomez)  
Jacobs (CA)  
(Correa)  
Kahele (Case)  
(Cicilline)  
Kelly (PA)  
(Balderson)  
Khanna (Gomez)  
Kirkpatrick  
(Pallone)  
Kuster  
(Bonamici)  
Larson (CT)  
(Cicilline)  
Lawson (FL)  
(Evans)  
Lofgren (Jeffries)  
Lowenthal  
(Beyer)  
Lucas (Burgess)  
Malinowski  
(Pallone)  
McEachin  
(Wexton)

Moore (WI)  
(Raskin)  
Napolitano  
(Correa)  
Payne (Pallone)  
Pingree  
(Bonamici)  
Porter (Wexton)  
Reed (Johnson  
(SD))  
Roybal-Allard  
(Correa)  
Ruiz (Correa)  
Rush (Kaptur)  
Salazar (Kim  
(CA))  
Schneider (Rice  
(NY))  
Sewell (Cicilline)  
Sires (Pallone)  
Soto (Wasserman  
Schultz)  
Strickland  
(Takano)  
Suozi (Raskin)  
Vargas (Correa)  
Waters (Jeffries)  
Watson Coleman  
(Pallone)  
Wilson (FL)  
(Cicilline)

Escobar  
Eshoo  
Espaillat  
Evans  
Fletcher  
Foster  
Frankel, Lois  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Higgins (NY)  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs (CA)  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (TX)  
Jones  
Kahele  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (NJ)  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Lamb

Maloney, Sean  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin

Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Suozi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClain  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meijer  
Meuser  
Miller (IL)  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks  
Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (AL)  
Moore (UT)  
Mullin  
Murphy (NC)

Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rose  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Roy  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker

## NOT VOTING—1

Kinzinger

□ 1421

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Baird (Bucshon)  
Bass (Takano)  
Bera (Correa)  
Bowman  
(Jeffries)  
Boyle, Brendan  
F. (Beyer)  
Brooks (Moore)  
(AL)  
Brownley (Meng)  
Clarke (NY)  
(Kelly (IL))  
Cohen (Beyer)  
Cooper (Beyer)  
Crist  
(Wasserman  
Schultz)  
Cuellar (Correa)  
DeSaulnier  
(Raskin)  
Doggett (Raskin)  
Dunn (Joyce  
(PA))  
Fallon (Ellzey)  
Frankel, Lois  
(Meng)  
Garamendi  
(Correa)  
Garbarino  
(Katko)  
Gohmert (Weber  
(TX))

Gonzalez (OH)  
(Balderson)  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
(Correa)  
Gosar (Gaetz)  
Grijalva (Garcia  
(IL))  
Hagedorn (Carl)  
Huffman (Gomez)  
Jacobs (CA)  
(Correa)  
Kahele (Case)  
Keating  
(Cicilline)  
Kelly (PA)  
(Balderson)  
Khanna (Gomez)  
Kirkpatrick  
(Pallone)  
Kuster  
(Bonamici)  
Larson (CT)  
(Cicilline)  
Lawson (FL)  
(Evans)  
Lofgren (Jeffries)  
Lowenthal  
(Beyer)  
Lucas (Burgess)  
Malinowski  
(Pallone)

McEachin  
(Wexton)  
Moore (WI)  
(Raskin)  
Napolitano  
(Correa)  
Payne (Pallone)  
Pingree  
(Bonamici)  
Porter (Wexton)  
Reed (Johnson  
(SD))  
Roybal-Allard  
(Correa)  
Ruiz (Correa)  
Rush (Kaptur)  
Salazar (Kim  
(CA))  
Schneider (Rice  
(NY))  
Sewell (Cicilline)  
Sires (Pallone)  
Soto (Wasserman  
Schultz)  
Strickland  
(Takano)  
Suozi (Raskin)  
Vargas (Correa)  
Waters (Jeffries)  
Watson Coleman  
(Pallone)  
Wilson (FL)  
(Cicilline)

## NAYS—211

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 211, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

## YEAS—221

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Auchincloss  
Axne  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bourdeaux  
Bowman  
Bowman  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.

Brown (MD)  
Brown (OH)  
Brownley  
Bush  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Cherfilus-  
McCormick  
Chu

Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davis, Danny K.  
Dean

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Banks  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carey  
Carl  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Cloud  
Clyde

Cole  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ellzey  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Fulcher  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garbarino  
Garcia (CA)  
Gibbs  
Gimenez  
Gohmert  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Good (VA)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar

Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guest  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrell  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice (GA)  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Hinson  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Issa  
Jackson  
Jacobs (NY)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Katko  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kustoff  
LaHood

## PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS TO RECEIVE A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Pursuant to House Resolution 912, H. Con. Res. 69 is hereby adopted.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 69

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, March 1,*